around Srinagar, Himachal Pradesh around Mandi and northern portion of Bihar adjoining Nepal.

Zone IV—Delhi, remaining portion of Jammu & Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim and adjoining West Bengal, parts of Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, a small portion near Calcutta and Maharashtra near Koyna (South of Bombay) and a part of Gujarat.

Zone III—Kerala, Goa, parts of Punjab, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh Bihar and adjoining West Bengal a small parts of Orissa near Bhubneswar, Andhra Pradesh and a small area of Rajasthan.

Zone II—Tamil Nadu, parts of Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and Orissa.

Zone I—Remaining parts of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh.

Zone V is seismically most active where earthquake of magnitude 8 or more on Richter scale may occur.

Zone I is the least seismically active area and earthquake of slight intensity only may occur.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Immediate relief is provided by the State Government. The Central Government supplements the efforts of the State Government.

Diplomatic status to ANC Mission in Delhi

4430. SHRI M.A. BABY : Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) what are the reasons for not granting full diplomatic Status to the ANC mission in Delhi; and

(b) when Government propose to confer the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (PROF. K. K. TEWARI) : (a) and (b) Government have consistently extended all possible political, moral and material support to the ANC. The question of according diplomatic status to the ANC Mission in Delhi continues to engage the attention of Government.

Tender for Supplying Combat Uniforms

4431. SHRI SHANKER SINGH VAGHELA :

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN :

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a report in the Indian Express dated the 25th May, 1988 that an offer of supplying combat uniforms made against a tender could not be availed of in April, 1983 due to failure of the Department of Defence Production and Supplies to indicate clearly the technical and commercial specifications and later on in June, 1983 a second tender had to be floated which resulted in paying an extra amount of about Rs. 5.10 crores, if so, what are the details thereof;

(b) whether an inquiry has been made, if so, what are the findings thereof and upon whom the responsibility has been fixed and with what follow-up action; and

(c) if no inquiry has been made what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI) : (a) to (c) The subject matter of the Question raised by Hon. MPs appeared in the Indian Express, dated 25.5.1988, under caption 'CAG report on defence services, delaying decisions ; favouring firms'. This subject has also appeared as para 9 in the CAG Report, for the period ending 31-3-1987. The main criticism of the Audit is that on account of re-tendering for procurement of Combat Dress, the Department had to incur extra expenditure to the tune of Rs. 5.10 crores for procurement of 16.55 lakh sets of uniform.

The factual position on examination is as follows :

(1) This was a newly introduced type of garment which was being procured for the first time, from the trade. The fabric required viz., 'Fabric Cotton Disruptive' was still under development by the mills. The type of pigment/process which will give the required properties was not clear at the time of the first tender enquiry. Further, this being the first purchase of fabricated garments by the Department, the sources had to be identified *ab-initio*. It was felt that the Department may even have to buy the fabric for supply to the contractors as 'free issue' material. Therefore the first tender enquiry was issued with options in regard to process of dyeing and for supplies as fully fabricated garment or fabric only or fabrication based on 'free-issue' fabric.

(2) These tenders could not, however, be finalised since the users by then categorically stated that only 'Vat Printed' fabric is acceptable. The Quotations received against the first tender also indicated that it would be desirable to place the order for 'fully fabricated' garments. This necessitated inclusion of certain new conditions of contract. Accordingly, re-tendering had to be done incorporating necessary changes in the terms and conditions. In the circumstances, higher price on account of the second tender compared to the first tender, should not be treated as extra expenditure.

(3) However, in response to the advice of Comptroller & Auditor General, for suitable remedial action instructions are being issued to all concerned that technical and commercial details of developmental stores should be firmed up as far as possible in the very first instance itself so that re-tendering can be avoided.

Purchase of Blankets by Department of Defence production and Supplies

4432. SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR :
SHRI LAL K. ADVANI :

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a report which appeared in the Indian Express dated the 25th May, 1988 that the Department of Defence Production and Supplies in procurings blankets from certain public sector undertakings (instead of procuring them from the open market) had incurred an extra expenditure of about Rs. 8.40 crores, if so, what are the details thereof; and

(b) whether the responsibility of this huge loss has been fixed and if so, what follow-up action has been taken against the concerned officials?